



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/985,879	11/06/2001	Joseph Nardone	003636.0126	4505

7590 05/30/2006

Attn: William H. Bollman  
Manelli Denison & Selter PLLC  
2000 M Street, NW  
Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20016

EXAMINER
----------

TRAN, QUOC A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 05/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

6

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/985,879	NARDONE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Quoc A. Tran	2176	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to Amendment filed on 03/09/2006, which claim benefit of 60/245,713 and 60/245,677 60/245,678 filed on 11/06/2000 to the original application filed 11/06/2001.
2. Claims 1-57 are pending. Claims 1, 12, 19, 30, 41, 46, 50 and 54 are independent claims.
3. Claims 1-18 and 41-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 has been withdrawn.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:  
  
*(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.*
5. Claims 1-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Hawkins et al. US Patent No. 6,000,000 - filed 05/04/1998 (hereinafter Hawkins '000), in view of Robertson US20010047441A1- Non-Provisional of Provisional 60/184,344 – filed 02/23/2000 (hereinafter Robertson '441), further in view of Smith “ The Multi-Boot Configuration Handbook” Publisher: Que ISBN: 0-7897-2283-6 – USA- Published 03/29/2000 (hereinafter Smith).

**In regard to independent claim 1, generating a first graphical user interface, (as taught by Hawkins '000 at col. 3, line 50 through col.4, line 50, also see Fig. 1 discloses an extendible method and apparatus for synchronizing multiple files on two different computers system, includes hand help computer system (item 110), a personal computer system (item 150) and a display representing computer system calendar program (item 115) and a mouse) Examiner read the above in the broadest**

Art Unit: 2176

reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein graphical user interface would have been an obvious variant of a personal computer system (item 150) and a display representing computer system calendar program (item 115) and a mouse) to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made,

**selecting a first database and a second database and second database on said first graphical user interface** (as taught by Hawkins '000 at col. 3, line 50 through col. 6, line 5, also see Fig.1- Fig.4 discloses an extendible method and apparatus for synchronizing multiple files on two different computers system, includes hand help computer system (item 110), a personal computer system (item 150) and a display representing computer system calendar program (item 115) and a mouse, includes the conduit libraries, wherein the synchronization system of Hawkins '000 is extendible such that it can also reconcile several other databases under control of a single synchronization system that can be started with a single key press),

**mapping at least one field of said first database to a corresponding field of said second database in a map file;** (Hawkins '000 at col.5, lines 10-40, also Fig. 4, discloses a sync manager library (item 410) the data between several different independent applications with different associated databases which run on the handheld computer system and the personal computer system. The sync manager dynamic link library, and conduit libraries operate to perform the synchronization of handheld applications A-C (items 471-473) with PC Applications A-C (items 481-483) associated with different Databases A-C (items 441-443)) Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein map file and mapping of databases would have been an obvious variant of The sync manager dynamic link library, and conduit libraries operate to perform the synchronization of handheld applications A-C (items 471-473) with PC Applications A-C (items 481-483) associated with different

Art Unit: 2176

Databases A-C (items 441-443) to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made,

**programming a conduit with said map file**, (Hawkins '000 at col. 15, lines 1-25, also Fig. 4, discloses the hotsync memory resident program first consults a sync registry that contains a list of conduit libraries that are used to synchronize different applications on the personal computer system and the palmtop computer system) Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein map file would have been an obvious variant of a sync registry that contains a list of conduit libraries that are used to synchronize to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Hawkins '000 does not explicitly teach, **executing said conduit with said map file in response to a synchronization request**, however (Robertson '441 page 4 paragraph [0057] through page 6 paragraph [0070], also see Fig. 6-7 discloses a communication system conduit for transferring data in the communication network, wherein FIG. 7 shows a sample user menu screen which prompts the user to chose the appropriate peripheral device (item 12) for data communication (i.e. data download or upload). As shown, the user may choose a number of options, namely PDA at step (208), laptop at step (210) and a multimedia device at step (212), being either a MPEG/MPG device at step (214), camera at step (216), or video at step (218) (FIG. 7). Once the user has selected the type of device that they wish to conduct the data transfer with, they are presented with another menu (not shown) which instructs them to choose a particular data format (i.e. since some devices have multi-format capabilities) Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein map file in response to a synchronization request would have been an obvious variant of a sample user menu

Art Unit: 2176

screen which prompts the user to chose the appropriate peripheral device (item 12) for data communication (i.e. data download or upload) to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Hawkins '000, generating a first graphical user interface for selecting a first database and a second database for mapping at least one field of said first database to a corresponding field of said second database in a map file and programming a conduit with said map file, further to include a mean of executing said conduit with said map file in response to a synchronization request of Robertson '441 teaching. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide user the ability to synchronize a communications system conduit for matching the data between different API that associated with different databases using single synchronization command (as taught by Hawkins at col. 1 line 30 through col. 2, line 61).

Hawkins '000 and Robertson '441 do not explicitly teach, **wherein said conduit provides synchronization rules from said map file for said first database and said second database**, however (Smith at Chapter 19 pages 1-23 and Chapter 17 pages 62-79, also Fig. 19.1-19.3 discloses the method of using FTP for cross-platform data exchange, wherein the two sides of FTP are client and server, also utilizing telnet (Tele communication networking) or SSH (Secure Shell), remote GUI (Graphical User Interface) control in the X-Window System, Virtual Network Computing (VNC) program and a method of modifying GUI look and feel for GUI add-ons for Windows, OS/2, BeOS. Further more on page 14 in third paragraph Smith discloses the means of using FTP such as, sending, requesting and /or accepting files between two

Art Unit: 2176

computers or server/client networking environment. In some sense this is what most networking protocols do: exchange files. Many other protocols also filter and process files in various ways, but in an FTP exchange, the files usually transfer from one computer's hard disk to the other computer's hard disk) Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein a first database and a second database and conduit provides synchronization rules would have been an obvious variant of from one computer's hard disk to the other computer's hard disk and using FTP such as, sending, requesting and /or accepting files between two computers or server/client networking environment to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, also (Smith at Chapter 19 pages 1-23 and Chapter 17 pages 62-79, illustrating in Fig. 19.3, an xmFTP witch is one of many GUIFTP clients wherein when connected, most GUI FTP clients present a list of local files in one window or one side of a window (the left pane in Fig. 19.3) and a list of remote files in another window or pane (the right pane in Fig. 19.3) and cross-platform application includes a description of using a text-based FTP client program and transfer a file by clicking the file you want and choosing a transfer menu item or toolbar icon) Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein a conduit and mapping file would have been an obvious variant of telnet with ftp and GUI FTP clients present a list of local files in one window or one side of a window (the left pane in Fig. 19.3) and a list of remote files in another window or pane (the right pane in Fig. 19.3) to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Hawkins '000, generating a first graphical

Art Unit: 2176

user interface for selecting a first database and a second database for mapping at least one field of said first database to a corresponding field of said second database in a map file and programming a conduit with said map file, further to include a mean of executing said conduit with said map file in response to a synchronization request of Robertson '441 teaching, and further to include a means of provides synchronization rules from said map file for said first database and said second database in a conduit of Smith's teaching . One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide user the ability to synchronize a communications system conduit for matching the data between different API (Application Interface) that associated with different databases using single synchronization command (as taught by Hawkins at col. 1 line 30 through col. 2, line 61).

**In regard to independent claims 12, 19, 30 and 41, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and in further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale, using the broadest the reasonable interpretation to the claims limitation Examiner read, configuring a conduit with a graphical user interface to synchronize a first database and a second database, initiating a synchronize requested ..., a plurality of mapping files associated with a plurality of databases; a configurable conduit programmed with a graphical user interface to synchronize...** would have been an obvious variant of generating a first graphical user interface, selecting a first database and a second database and second database on said first graphical user interface mapping at least one field of said first database to a corresponding field of said second database in a map file programming a conduit with said map file executing said conduit with said map file in response to a



synchronization request wherein said conduit provides synchronization rules from said map file for said first database and said second database and further view of the following,

Hawkins '000 at col. 15, lines 1-25, also Fig. 4, discloses the hotsync memory resident program first consults a sync registry that contains a list of conduit libraries that are used to synchronize different applications on the personal computer system and the palmtop computer system) Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein a plurality of map files would have been an obvious variant of a sync registry that contains a list of conduit libraries that are used to synchronize to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

**In regard to independent claims 46 and 54,** incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to independent claim 50,** incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale. Using the broadest the reasonable interpretation to the claims limitation Examiner read, a selector to select would have been an obvious variant of GUI (Graphical User Interface) to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

**In regard to dependent claim 2,** incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1, 41 and 50 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale,

**and importing said other one of said first database and said second database in response to selection of said first database and said second database** (as taught by Hawkins '000 at col. 5, lines 25-40, i.e. The sync manager library 410 implements a library of functions

Art Unit: 2176

that are made available to other programs for synchronizing databases. To communicate with the handheld computer 110 the sync manager library 410 also uses the communication link code such as communication link X code 451 that controls communication link X 411... the sync manager library 410 oversees the synchronization process and uses individual "Conduit" libraries to perform the synchronization of each database...).

**In regard to dependent claim 3**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale,

**wherein said one of said first database and said second database is a client application database and an other of said first database and said second database is an enterprise application database**, however (Smith at Chapter 19 pages 1-23 and Chapter 17 pages 62-79, also Fig. 19.1- 19.3 discloses the method of using FTP for cross-platform data exchange, wherein the two sides of FTP are client and server).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Hawkins '000, generating a first graphical user interface for selecting a first database and a second database for mapping at least one field of said first database to a corresponding field of said second database in a map file and programming a conduit with said map file, further to include a mean of executing said conduit with said map file in response to a synchronization request of Robertson '441 teaching, and further to include a means of provides synchronization rules from said map file for said first database (e.g. client) and said second database (e.g. server) in a conduit of Smith's teaching . One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to

provide user the ability to synchronize a communications system conduit for matching the data between different API (Application Interface) that associated with different databases using single synchronization command (as taught by Hawkins at col. 1 line 30 through col. 2, line 61).

**In regard to dependent claim 4**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale,

**generating a second graphical user interface**, however (Smith at Chapter 19 pages 1-23 and Chapter 17 pages 62-79, illustrating in Fig. 19.3, an xmFTP witch is one of many GUIFTP clients wherein when connected, most GUI FTP clients present a list of local files in one window or one side of a window (the left pane in Fig. 19.3) and a list of remote files in another window or pane (the right pane in Fig. 19.3) and cross-platform application includes a description of using a text-based FTP client program and transfer a file by clicking the file you want and choosing a transfer menu item or toolbar icon).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Hawkins '000, generating a first graphical user interface for selecting a first database and a second database for mapping at least one field of said first database to a corresponding field of said second database in a map file and programming a conduit with said map file, further to include a mean of executing said conduit with said map file in response to a synchronization request of Robertson '441 teaching, and further to include a means of generating a second graphical user interface and synchronization rules from said map file for said first database (e.g. client) and said second database (e.g.

Art Unit: 2176

server) in a conduit of Smith's teaching . One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide user the ability to synchronize a communications system conduit for matching the data between different API (Application Interface) that associated with different databases using single synchronization command (as taught by Hawkins at col. 1 line 30 through col. 2, line 61).

**In regard to dependent claim 5**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-2 and 4 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 6**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-2, 4 and 5 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 7**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-2, and 4-6 above, and in further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale,

**generating a third graphical user interface**, however (Smith at Chapter 19 pages 1-23 and Chapter 17 pages 62-79, illustrating in Fig. 19.3, an xmFTP witch is one of many GUIFTP clients wherein when connected, most GUI FTP clients present a list of local files in one window or one side of a window (the left pane in Fig. 19.3) and a list of remote files in another window or pane (the right pane in Fig. 19.3) and cross-platform application includes a description of using a text-based FTP client program and transfer a file by clicking the file you want and choosing a transfer menu item or toolbar icon).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Hawkins '000, generating a first graphical

Art Unit: 2176

user interface for selecting a first database and a second database for mapping at least one field of said first database to a corresponding field of said second database in a map file and programming a conduit with said map file, further to include a mean of executing said conduit with said map file in response to a synchronization request of Robertson '441 teaching, and further to include a means of generating a third graphical user interface and synchronization rules from said map file for said first database (e.g. client) and said second database (e.g. server) in a conduit of Smith's teaching. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide user the ability to synchronize a communications system conduit for matching the data between different API (Application Interface) that associated with different databases using single synchronization command (as taught by Hawkins at col. 1 line 30 through col. 2, line 61).

**In regard to dependent claim 8**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-2, and 4-7 above, and in further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale,

**deleting said rule from said set of rules**, however (Smith at Chapter 19 pages 1-23 and Chapter 17 pages 62-79, illustrating in Fig. 19.1, GUI tools enable and/or disable FTP service by checking appropriate configuration) Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein deleting said rule from said set of rules would have been an obvious variant of disable FTP service by checking appropriate configuration (e.g. Delete radio button) to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Hawkins '000, generating a first graphical user interface for selecting a first database and a second database for mapping at least one field of said first database to a corresponding field of said second database in a map file and programming a conduit with said map file, further to include a mean of executing said conduit with said map file in response to a synchronization request of Robertson '441 teaching, and further to include a means of generating a third graphical user interface and synchronization rules from said map file for said first database (e.g. client) and said second database (e.g. server) in a conduit of Smith's teaching. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide user the ability to synchronize a communications system conduit for matching the data between different API (Application Interface) that associated with different databases using single synchronization command (as taught by Hawkins at col. 1 line 30 through col. 2, line 61).

**In regard to dependent claim 9**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-2, and 4-7 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 10**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-2, and 4-8 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 11**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-2, and 4-10 above, and in further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale,

**saving said set of rules as said map file** (as taught by Hawkins '000 at col. 11, lines 40-45, Instructs the handheld computer system to locate and retrieve the information then store it in the passed structure. The calling client Conduit library must allocate enough memory in the general data area to hold the responding information...).

**In regard to independent claim 13**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-2 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to independent claim 14**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 2 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 15**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1, 41 and 50 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale,

**displaying a plurality of fields of said first database and a plurality of fields of said second database within a display element of said first graphical user interface**, however (Smith at Chapter 19 pages 1-23 and Chapter 17 pages 62-79, illustrating in Fig. 19.1 and 19.3, an xmFTP witch is one of many GUIFTP clients wherein when connected, most GUI FTP clients present a list of local files in one window or one side of a window (the left pane in Fig. 19.3) and a list of remote files in another window or pane (the right pane in Fig. 19.3) and cross-platform application includes a description of using a text-based FTP client program and transfer a file by clicking the file you want and choosing a transfer menu item or toolbar icon).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Hawkins '000, generating a first graphical user interface for selecting a first database and a second database for mapping at least one field

of said first database to a corresponding field of said second database in a map file and programming a conduit with said map file, further to include a mean of executing said conduit with said map file in response to a synchronization request of Robertson '441 teaching, and further to include a means of displaying a plurality of fields of said first database and a plurality of fields of said second database within a display element of said first graphical user interface, and synchronization rules from said map file for said first database (e.g. client) and said second database (e.g. server) in a conduit of Smith's teaching . One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide user the ability to synchronize a communications system conduit for matching the data between different API (Application Interface) that associated with different databases using single synchronization command (as taught by Hawkins at col. 1 line 30 through col. 2, line 61).

**In regard to dependent claim 16**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 8 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 17**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 7, 9, and 10 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 18**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 11 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 20**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-2, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 21**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 3, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.



**In regard to dependent claims 22-29 consecutively**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 4-11 consecutively, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 31**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-2, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 32**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 3, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claims 33-40 consecutively**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 4-11 consecutively, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to claim 42**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-2, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claims 43-44**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 3, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 45**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1, 41 and 50 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale,

**overwrite of data between a first database and a second database**, however (Smith at Chapter 19 pages 1-23 and Chapter 17 pages 62-79, also Fig. 19.1- 19.3 discloses the method of using FTP for cross-platform data exchange. In some sense this is what most networking protocols do: exchange files. Many other protocols also filter and process files in various ways, but in an FTP exchange, the files usually transfer from one computer's hard disk to the other

computer's hard disk) Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein overwrite of data between a first database and a second database, would have been an obvious variant of data exchange from one computer's hard disk to the other computer's hard disk to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Hawkins '000, generating a first graphical user interface for selecting a first database and a second database for mapping at least one field of said first database to a corresponding field of said second database in a map file and programming a conduit with said map file, further to include a mean of executing said conduit with said map file in response to a synchronization request of Robertson '441 teaching, and further to include a means of generating a third graphical user interface and synchronization rules from said map file for said first database (e.g. client) and said second database (e.g. server) in a conduit of Smith's teaching. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide user the ability to synchronize a communications system conduit for matching the data between different API (Application Interface) that associated with different databases using single synchronization command (as taught by Hawkins at col. 1 line 30 through col. 2, line 61).

**In regard to dependent claim 51**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale. Using the broadest the reasonable interpretation to the claims limitation Examiner read, a mapper to map would have been an obvious variant of GUI (Graphical User Interface) to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

**In regard to dependent claims 47-49, and 52-53**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-3 and 51, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claims 55-57**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-3, 50 and 54, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 03/09/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The reason is set forth in the current Office Action cited above and further view of the following:

**Brief description of cited prior arts:**

**Hawkins** discloses a methodology and apparatus for transferring and synchronizing content between handheld devices and a personal computer, which includes communication link monitor, sync manager, process and reconcile the conduit databases.

**Robertson** discloses a method and a communication system conduit of multi-platform for downloading and/or uploading to and from a wide variety of end user devises, which includes an interface module, a data conversion module couple to a plurality of access ports.

**Smith** discloses the multi-boot configuration handbook for uses with X Windows System and the Virtual Network Computing (VPN), which includes GUI for uses with File Transfer Protocol (FTP) for Cross-Platform data Exchange (i.e. known as telnet).

Response to Arguments:

Beginning on page 19 of the Remarks (hereinafter the remarks), Applicant argues the following issues, which are accordingly addressed below.

**Applicant's arguments, on page 19 and 23 of the remarks that Pajakowski is mention in the heading, but never use in the rejection and the need to combined Four references is an indication of the non-obviousness of claims 1-57.**

The Examiner thank you the Applicants for pointing out the Examiner typo error, the Examiner respectfully notes that the Pajakowski reference has no effect to the patentability of the current rejection and does not place the application in the position for allowance.

More over he Examiner respectfully notes that the Examiner has combined an excessive number of references, reliance on a large number of references in a rejection does not, without more, weigh against the obviousness of the claimed invention. See *In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

**Applicant's arguments, on pages 19-23 of the remarks that Hawkins in combination with Robertson and Smith fails to disclose HOW the synchronization program that selects two databases created, also fails to discloses or suggest GUI to select a first database and a second database as a basis for programming a conduit, much less a GUI to program a configurable to synchronize database as recited in claims 1-57.**

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner respectfully notes that **Hawkins** discloses a methodology and apparatus for transferring and synchronizing content between handheld devices and a personal computer, which includes communication link monitor, sync manager, process and reconcile the conduit databases (see Hawkins whole document and particularly as illustrated at Figure 4 sheet 4 of 7), Hawkins disclosed a block diagram of an architecture for synchronizing databases on a handheld computer system and a personal computer system. The synchronization architecture illustrated in FIG. 4 accommodates several different application programs with associated databases running on the personal computer 150 and the handheld computer system 110, wherein connecting said first computer system to said second computer system with a data communications link; providing a library of functions in said second computer system for accessing information on said first computer system; creating a conduit program database, said conduit program database for storing a list of conduit programs that may be executed, registering a first conduit program by placing an identifier for said first conduit program in said conduit program database, said first conduit program comprising a computer program on said second computer system for performing a specific data transfer task; successively executing a set of conduit programs identified within said conduit program database from a manager program, each of said conduit programs accessing said library of functions for communicating with said first computer system;

Those cited above evidenced the processes of Hawkins's teaching of **HOW** the synchronization program that selects two databases is created.

Further more (as taught by Hawkins '000 at col. 3, line 50 through col.4, line 50, also see Fig. 1), discloses an extendible method and apparatus for synchronizing multiple files on two different

Art Unit: 2176

computers system, includes hand help computer system (item 110), a personal computer system (item 150) and a display representing computer system calendar program (item 115) and a mouse) Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein graphical user interface would have been an obvious variant of a personal computer system (item 150) and a display representing computer system calendar program (item 115) and a mouse) to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made,

The examiner respectfully notes that (see Robertson at page 4 paragraph [0058] also see Fig. 6-7), shows a sample user menu screen which prompts the user to chose the appropriate peripheral device 12 for data communication (i.e. data download or upload). As shown, the user may choose a number of options, namely PDA at step (208), laptop at step (210) and a multimedia device at step (212), being either a MPEG/MPG device at step (214), camera at step (216), or video at step (218) (FIG. 7).

The examiner respectfully notes that prompts the user to choose the appropriate peripheral device 12 for data communication (i.e. data download or upload) menu screen would have been obvious variant of GUI for selecting o a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Those cited above evidenced of Hawkins and Robertson provides GUI so users can select a first database and a second database to synchronize database.

**Applicant's arguments, on page 23 and 24 of the remarks that Smith fails to even mention a conduit, a map file and synchronization of two databases, much less HOW a**

**conduit is created, much less discloses use of a GUI as a basis to create a conduit, as recited by claims 1-57.**

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner respectfully notes that **Hawkins** discloses a methodology and apparatus for transferring and synchronizing content between handheld devices and a personal computer, which includes communication link monitor, sync manager, process and reconcile the conduit databases (see Hawkins whole document and particularly as illustrated at Figure 4 sheet 4 of 7), Hawkins disclosed a block diagram of an architecture for synchronizing databases on a handheld computer system and a personal computer system. The synchronization architecture illustrated in FIG. 4 accommodates several different application programs with associated databases running on the personal computer 150 and the handheld computer system 110, wherein connecting said first computer system to said second computer system with a data communications link; providing a library of functions in said second computer system for accessing information on said first computer system; creating a conduit program database, said conduit program database for storing a list of conduit programs that may be executed, registering a first conduit program by placing an identifier for said first conduit program in said conduit program database, said first conduit program comprising a computer program on said second computer system for performing a specific data transfer task; successively executing a set of conduit programs identified within said conduit program database from a manager program, each of said conduit programs accessing said library of functions for communicating with said first computer system;

Those cited above evidenced the processes of Hawkins's teaching of **HOW** the synchronization program that selects two databases is created.

Further more (as taught by Hawkins '000 at col. 3, line 50 through col.4, line 50, also see Fig. 1), discloses an extendible method and apparatus for synchronizing multiple files on two different computers system, includes hand help computer system (item 110), a personal computer system (item 150) and a display representing computer system calendar program (item 115) and a mouse) Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein graphical user interface would have been an obvious variant of a personal computer system (item 150) and a display representing computer system calendar program (item 115) and a mouse) to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made,

The examiner respectfully notes that (see Robertson at page 4 paragraph [0058] also see Fig. 6-7), shows a sample user menu screen which prompts the user to chose the appropriate peripheral device 12 for data communication (i.e. data download or upload). As shown, the user may choose a number of options, namely PDA at step (208), laptop at step (210) and a multimedia device at step (212), being either a MPEG/MPG device at step (214), camera at step (216), or video at step (218) (FIG. 7).

The examiner respectfully notes that prompts the user to choose the appropriate peripheral device 12 for data communication (i.e. data download or upload) menu screen would have been obvious variant of GUI for selecting o a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Those cited above evidenced of Hawkins and Robertson provides GUI so users can select a first database and a second database to synchronize database.

and further view of the following, (Hawkins '000 at col.5, lines 10-40, also see Hawkins '000 at col. 15, lines 1-25, also Fig. 4), discloses the hotsync memory resident program first



Art Unit: 2176

consults a sync registry that contains a list of conduit libraries that are used to synchronize different applications on the personal computer system and the palmtop computer system,

and further view of (Robertson at page 4 paragraph [0058] also see Fig. 6-7), shows a sample user menu screen which prompts the user to chose the appropriate peripheral device 12 for data communication (i.e. data download or upload). As shown, the user may choose a number of options, namely PDA at step (208), laptop at step (210) and a multimedia device at step (212), being either a MPEG/MPG device at step (214), camera at step (216), or video at step (218) (FIG. 7).

The examiner respectfully notes that, the Examiner relies on the Smith reference for teaching the feature as such, **wherein said conduit provides synchronization rules from said map file for said first database and said second database**, (see Smith at Chapter 19 pages 1-23 and Chapter 17 pages 62-79, also Fig. 19.1- 19.3) discloses the multi-boot configuration handbook for uses with X Windows System and the Virtual Network Computing (VPN), which includes GUI for uses with File Transfer Protocol (FTP) for Cross-Platform data Exchange (i.e. known as telnet).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Hawkins '000 and Robertson '441 teaching, and further to include a means of provides synchronization rules from said map file for said first database and said second database in a conduit of Smith's teaching. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification, because they are from the same field of endeavor of GUI for uses with File Transfer Protocol (FTP) for Cross-Platform data Exchange and for transferring and synchronizing content between handheld devices and a

Art Unit: 2176

personal computer, which includes communication link monitor, sync manager, process and reconcile the conduit databases, and provides user the ability to synchronize a communications system conduit for matching the data between different API (Application Interface) that associated with different databases using single synchronization command (as taught by Hawkins at col. 1 line 30 through col. 2, line 61).

Therefor the Examiner respectfully maintains the rejection of claims 1-57 for at least the reason cited above at this time.

***Conclusion***

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2176

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-4103. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9 AM to 5 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Herndon R. Heather can be reached on (571) -272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

---

*Quoc A. Tran*  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2176  
May 22, 2006

*William L. Bashore*  
**WILLIAM BASHORE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**